

REMARKS

Claims 1-57 were pending in the present application. Applicants have amended claims 12 – 15. Claims 1 – 57 remain pending in the application. Reconsideration is respectfully requested in light of the following remarks.

The Examiner objected to the title of the application as not descriptive. Applicants have changed the title to “Secure Access to Network Objects using a Platform-Independent CORBA Gateway”.

The Examiner objected to Figure 1b as needing a “Prior Art” legend. Applicants have amended Fig. 1b as requested by the Examiner, while maintaining that Fig. 1b is distinct from prior art, as described by the specification. Specifically, Fig. 1b illustrates a computer system configured to implement various aspects of the invention. While the invention may be implemented on prior art computer hardware, Fig. 1b represents a computer configured to implement one or more aspects of the invention, and thus does not represent the prior art. Thus, the “Prior Art” legend has been added to Fig. 1b only as an indication that the invention may be implemented on a prior art computer system.

Section 103(a) Rejection:

The Office Action rejected claims 1-57 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barker, et al. (U.S. Patent 6,363,421) (hereinafter "Barker") in view of Grantges, Jr. (U.S. Patent 6,324,648) (hereinafter "Grantges").

Neither Barker nor Grantges teach a method wherein the gateway is configurable to provide object-level access control between the managers and the managed objects, as recited in Applicant's claim 1. As the Examiner noted, Barker does not show object-level access control between the managers and the managed objects. The Examiner relies on Grantges. However, Grantges only teaches a gateway creating a cookie to allow messages to pass from a client computer through a firewall to a

selected application on a secure network. (Abstract) Grantges does not teach or suggest object-level access control between the managers and the managed objects. Therefore, claim 1 is patentable over Barker and Grantges.

Claims 20 and 39 recite limitations similar to claim 1. Claims 1, 20, and 39, along with each of their dependent claims, are therefore believed to distinguish over Barker and Grantges.

Furthermore, Applicant can find no language in Barker or Grantges that teaches the gateway is configurable to authenticate the managers to receive the events from or to send the requests to the managed objects as a function of the identity of the managed object, as recited in applicant's claim 3. The teaching in Barker regarding basic server authentication and secure socket layer does not teach or suggest authenticating the managers to receive the events from or to send the requests to the managed objects as a function of the identity of the managed object. Nor does Grantges teach this limitation. Claims 32 and 41 also recite limitations similar to claim 3, and are thus also believed to be further patentable over Barker and Grantges.

Furthermore, Applicant can find no language in Barker or Grantges that teaches the gateway providing access to a logging service, as recited in applicant's claim 11. At col. 30, lines 44 – 63, Barker states that a client application must register with the server by providing identification of the client host, port, client, and a password. Grantges teaches that information security may provide login access reports. (col. 7, lines 54 – 58) However, neither Barker nor Grantges teaches or suggests that the gateway provide access to a logging service. Therefore, claim 11 is further patentable over Barker and Grantges. Claims 30 and 49 also recite limitations similar to claim 11, and are thus also believed to be further patentable over Barker and Grantges.

Applicants also assert that numerous ones of the other dependent claims also recite further distinctions over the cited art. However, since the independent claims have

been shown to be patentably distinct, a further discussion of additional dependent claims is not required at this time.

CONCLUSION

Applicants submit the application is in condition for allowance, and notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

If any fees are due, the Commissioner is authorized to charge said fees to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C. Deposit Account No. 501505/5181-48400/RCK.

Also enclosed herewith are the following items:

- Return Receipt Postcard
- Petition for Extension of Time
- Notice of Change of Address
- Fee Authorization Form authorizing a deposit account debit in the amount of \$ for fees ().
- Other:

Respectfully submitted,



Robert C. Kowert
Reg. No. 39,255
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT(S)

Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C.
P.O. Box 398
Austin, TX 78767-0398
Phone: (512) 853-8850

Date: January 21, 2004